

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-21 are pending in the Application.

Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-21 stand rejected.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, where the Examiner has asserted that the limitation “the grid substrate” has no antecedent basis. In response, Applicants have amended claim 6 to resolve this issue.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-10, 12 and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Akama* (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,092). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 15 recite that the plurality of grid portions each define a single pixel site. This is not taught in *Akama*, since each grid electrode 107a defines a plurality of pixel sites 101. A plurality of pixel sites is not a single pixel site.

In the rejection of claim 15, the Examiner does not adequately address the recitation in this claim that the grid portions each control emissions of electrons from a single pixel of the cathode. Thus, it is Applicants’ position that the Examiner has failed to prove a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 15, since the Examiner has not adequately addressed this particular claim limitation.

With respect to claims 19 and 21, the Examiner has also failed to adequately address these claim limitations, by merely pointing to Figure 42 in *Akama* as anticipating the entirety of claim 19, without particularly pointing out which portions of Figure 42 teach each of the limitations recited within claim 19. The same is true with respect to claim 21, where the Examiner has failed to prove a *prima facie* case of anticipation by merely citing the entirety of

the *Akama* patent for teaching the limitations of claim 21, without particularly addressing each of the limitations in claim 21 and showing what portions of the *Akama* invention teach each of these limitations. The Examiner in rejecting claims 19-21 has not clearly explained the pertinence of the *Akama* reference. 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2).

As a result of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims remaining in the Application are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

By:
Kelly K. Kordzik
Reg. No. 36,571

5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75270-2199
(512) 370-2851

AUSTIN 12443101
12179-P092US 03/10/2004